

pulses. The claimed subject matter supports reducing ocular damage to humans, who may come in contact with the laser pulses, and producing an efficient optical link (see specification page 1, lines 18-28). (References herein to the specification and drawings are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to limit the scope of the invention to the referenced embodiments.)

The Final Rejection proposes that a skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Knapp's laser system to linearly increase the charging time of a capacitor, which stores energy for the laser, as a function of time so as to compensate for the inverse square law of laser intensity as the laser source moves away from a receiver (see Final Rejection page 5, lines 11-14). It is noted that this motivation is the motivation identified in Applicants' specification (see specification page 1, line 18, through page 2, line 2, and page 3, lines 5-14). Knapp's laser system could be operated at maximum power at all times to ensure high quality reception of the laser. Thus, the Final Rejection seems to be relying on the hindsight afforded by Applicants' disclosure to provide the motivation to modify Knapp's laser system.

Moreover, Knapp discloses illuminating a target so as to guide a missile towards the target. By contrast, the claimed invention locates a moving object (e.g., missile) but not the target of the moving object.

Furthermore, the Final Rejection proposes that Knapp discloses a delay timer that delays the emission of laser pulses until a moving body has departed (see Final Rejection section 2, lines 10-11). However, Knapp discloses that a timer 32 is intended to conserve electric power and prevent detection of a gun's location by hostile forces (see Knapp col. 3, lines 13-16). By contrast to Knapp's disclosure, the feature of the present claimed invention directed to delay of

laser pulse emissions is intended to protect the eyes of humans who come into contact with the claimed laser pulses.

Hannan, Horblin, PLF, and Intensity are not cited for supplementing the teachings of Knapp with regard to the above-mentioned deficiencies of Knapp's disclosure, with respect to the claimed subject matter.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the applied references, considered individually or in combination, do not render obvious the subject matter defined by claim 8. Independent claim 9 similarly recites the above-mentioned subject matter distinguishing method claim 8 from the applied references, but with respect to an apparatus. Therefore, the rejection applied to claim 11 is obviated and allowance of claims 8 and 9 and all claims dependent therefrom is warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Date: October 9, 2008
JEL/DWW/att
Attorney Docket No. 073070-04148
Dickinson Wright, PLLC
1901 L Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C.
20036-3506
Telephone: (202) 457-0160
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559